REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 16-23 and 26-28 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 16 and 26-28 are independent claims.

The examiner rejected claims 1 and 16 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 1-8 and 16-23 to clearly recite "a computer-implement method." Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 16-23, as amended, are directed towards statutory subject matter.

The examiner uses Swannack to reject claims 1, 6-8, 16-18 and 26-28 as having been anticipated.

Claims 1, 8, 16, 26-28 recite "generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules," or similar language. At least this quoted claim feature is neither disclosed or suggested in Swannack.

Swannack merely discloses a scoring method. More particularly, Swannack discloses:

> A system (20) is provided which allows for definition of agents for discrimination and classification of data submitted thereto. Each agent is a collection of data defining a topic, or theme, of interest, in natural language. This definition is combined with classification rules which generate classification scores when applied to a document. (see Abstract)

Swannack merely describes a relevance scoring:

> The search and monitoring system 20 stores definitions of themes on the basis of which searches are to be carried out. A theme is constructed from a description of subject matter, such as might be manually input by a user or might be retrieved from an encyclopedia. The frequency of words contained in the theme definition in the language of the theme description is noted for use in classifying a document as to its relevance to the theme. (Page 3, paragraph 0040)

This is very different from generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules. As described in applicant's detailed description at page 5, lines 9-11, "The method entails matching the user's query against an element in the database, and

summarizing the best match found in a descriptive hyperlinked text string, or teaser." Accordingly, claims 1, 6-8, 16-18 and 26-28 are not anticipated by Swannack.

The examiner uses Swannack and White to reject claims 2-3 and 19-23 as having been obvious.

Claims 1 and 16 are not rendered obvious by Swannack and White, whether taken separately or in combination. As described above, Swannack discloses a relevance scoring method and does not teach or suggest generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules. White fails to provide for this deficiency in Swannack.

White teaches improvements to the database storage technology to generate more efficient indexes, i.e., White is concerned with a particular way to improve database efficiency by reorganizing the internal indexing structure. White is merely another method of scoring. More specifically, White teaches:

> The system implements methods for storing data vertically (i.e., by column), instead of horizontally (i.e., by row) as is traditionally done. (See Abstract)

Here again, this is very different from generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules.

One skilled in this art would not be led to Swannack and White because combining these two references would only lead to relevance scoring and not generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules. Accordingly, claims 1 and 16 are not rendered obvious by Swannack and White.

Claims 2-3 and 19-23 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, claims 2-3 and 19-23 are not rendered obvious by Swannack and White.

The examiner uses Swannack and Sheth to reject claims 4 and 5 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 recites "generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules." As described above, Swannack does not teach or suggest this quoted claim feature.

Sheth teaches a method for semantically classifying data:

> This semantic-based method captures and enhances domain or subject specific metadata of digital media content, including the specific meaning and intended use of original content. The digital media content can be semi-structured text, audio, video, animations, etc. To support semantics, the present invention uses a WorldModel that includes specific domain knowledge, ontologies as well as a set of rules relevant to the original content. The metabase is also dynamic because it may track changes to locally or remotely accessible content, including live and archival TV and radio programming. Because these tasks would be labor intensive if performed manually, two methods and apparatus have been designed and implemented. First, a distributed method and apparatus to quickly produce agents which automatically create and manage digital media metadata. Second, a WorldModel that embodies the essence of semantics that I s used by the agents and captured in the metadata they produce. The WorldModel cooperates with an associated Knowledge base that uses semantics to enhance relevant information that may not be present in the original source. Assets, profile and personalization information as well as advertisement and e-commerce are correlated through the WorldModel. (col. 4, lines 59-67; col. 5, lines 1-14).

One skilled in this art would not be led to Swannack and White because combining these two references would only lead to semantically classifying relevance scores and not generating associated teasers for each of the enumerated queries using query-matching rules. Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Swannack and Sheth.

Claims 4 and 5 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4 and 5 are not rendered obvious by Swannack and Sheth.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 15, 2005

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21029323.doc